

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 98-4840

CHRISTOPHER K. WILLIAMS,
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News.
Jerome B. Friedman, District Judge.
(CR-98-34)

Submitted: May 18, 1999

Decided: June 11, 1999

Before HAMILTON and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and
HALL, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Richard C. Kerns, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellant. Helen F.
Fahey, United States Attorney, James A. Metcalfe, Assistant United
States Attorney, Kenneth L. Poortvliet, Third-Year Law Student, Nor-
folk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Christopher K. Williams appeals from a ninety-three month sentence imposed following his convictions for possession with the intent to distribute cocaine, 21 U.S.C.A. § 841(a) (West 1981), and carrying a firearm during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime, 18 U.S.C.A. § 924(c) (West Supp. 1999). Williams challenges the district court's admission of evidence without requiring every person in the chain-of-custody to testify, challenges the sufficiency of the evidence against him on both convictions, and challenges the district court's enhancement of his sentence for perjury. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error.

Based on the testimony of Trooper Hayes and the Naval Criminal Investigative Service chemist, we find that the district court did not abuse its discretion when it admitted the challenged evidence. See United States v. Turpin, 65 F.3d 1207, 1213 (4th Cir. 1995); see also United States v. Howard-Arias, 679 F.2d 363, 366 (4th Cir. 1982). We also find that viewing all of the evidence in a light most favorable to the Government, the evidence was sufficient to support Williams' convictions for possessing cocaine with the intent to distribute and carrying a firearm for protection while trafficking the cocaine. See United States v. Burgos, 94 F.3d 849, 862 (4th Cir. 1996) (en banc); see also United States v. Mitchell, 104 F.3d 649, 652-53 (4th Cir. 1997). Further, our review of the record confirms that the district court appropriately identified specific statements by Williams that were false, about material matters, and made with the willful intent to provide false testimony. We therefore conclude that the district court did not clearly err when it enhanced his sentence for perjury. See United States v. Murray, 65 F.3d 1161, 1165 (4th Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, we affirm Williams' convictions and sentence. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED